DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 167 056 HE 011 080

AUTHOR Pemberton, S. Macpherson
TITLE Inequality in Higher Education: Some Federal Policies Reviewed.
INSTITUTION Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Jan 79
NOTE 70p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Access to Education; Black Students; *College Integration; *Compensatory Education Programs; Disadvantaged Groups; Educational Finance; Educational Policy; *Equal Education; Federal Aid; *Federal Programs; Financial Needs; Government School Relationship; Higher Education; Minority Groups; Public Policy; *Student Financial Aid; Tuition Grants

ABSTRACT

Federal regulations dealing with desegregation, student financial assistance, and compensatory education, designed to create equal opportunity in higher education are discussed. Desegregation is viewed as a means of guaranteeing equal opportunity and equal attainment for black students. Although progress has been made, a continuing disparity between the percentage of blacks in the population and the percentage enrolled in public colleges and universities is evident with the greatest disparity apparent in professional schools. Problems that several states have experienced in meeting desegregation requirements are discussed and the goals and successes of desegregation are assessed. Student financial aid programs including the Basic Educational Opportunity Grants Program, Supplementary Educational Opportunity Grants, the State Student Incentive Grant Program, College Work-Study, and the National Direct Student Loan Program are explained. Problems and recommended changes are presented for each program. Compensatory education programs (Upward Bound, Special Services, Talent Search, College Discovery and Development Program and Student Aid), defined as programs for disadvantaged students, focus on special services, student aid, professional employment, curriculum education, teacher training, research related to different cultures and library aid. Their goals, achievements and the impact they have had on higher education are discussed. Eighteen recommendations on the future direction of these programs are provided. (BH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED167056

copy #1

INEQUALITY IN HIGHER EDUCATION: SOME FEDERAL POLICIES REVIEWED

by

S. Macpherson Pemberton

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

Office of Education

Washington, D.C.

January, 1979

HE 011 080

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. On Desegregation	1
II. On Student Financial Assistance	25
III. On Compensatory Education	46

1. ON DESEGREGATION

Equality of educational opportunity for Black Americans is closely intertwined with the issue of race relations. The integration of American schools, colleges and universities, and the concept of equal opportunity for educational attainment have an impact on the degree of access for Blacks in higher education. It is important that there must not be only equal opportunity for Blacks, but also equal attainment and productivity. Desegregation has been one means to this end.

The Civil Rights Act of 1964 helped bring about some desegregation in the South. Some gains have been made in diminishing racial segregation required or authorized by State Law. Much of this has been effected through the exercise of Federal enforcement powers, the threat of Lund termination under Title III of the Civil Rights Act, and law suits filed by the Attorney General under Title IV of the same Act.

The Federal Government makes grants under two sections of Title IV to institutions of higher learning to meet desegregation problems. Under Section 403, colleges and universities under contract with the U.S. Office of Education, provides technical assistance to local school boards in preparing and implementing desegregation plans. Under Section 404, the institutions under grant or contract with the Office of Education, conduct training institutes for school personnel. Grants under both Sections have been merged into a single program. Such forms of assistance are provided through "desegregation centers" which are often affiliated with

a university's school of education from which they draw heavily for staff and other resources. Activities at the centers include training programs and short-term conferences for school districts, and assistance to local districts in the preparation of proposals for direct assistance under Title IV.

The concept of desegregation centers was not contemplated at the time of the passages of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, but interpretations of Section 403 (technical ssistance) and Section 404 (grants or contracts with institutions of higher education) by the Office through desegregation.

. Civil Rights Act of 1964, P.L. 88-352, Title IV, Section 403.

. Civil Rights Act of 1964, P.L. 88-352, Title IV, Section 404.

These two functions of Title IV have, from time to time, impacted on the equal educational opportunity for Black Americans.

Title IV of the Civil Rights Act is a unique law in its own right. It does not prohibit, nor is it a weapon of enforcement. It is basically conciliatory. Through Title IV the opportunity has been presented to assure that the change from segregated to integrated education can be accomplished peacefully and successfully. The entities involved under the Title IV program represent key elements in the educational process, each being able to contribute in its way to the achievement of successful desegregation. One of these entities, the college or university, provides a reservoir of technical knowledge and competence and frequently receives grants from the Office of Education for the purpose of conducting training institutes for school districts.

Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 is directed at desegregating dual racial systems of higher education in several ways. It empowers the Attorney General on receiving a signed complaint, to bring legal action against any (public?) college which denies a student admission or the opportunity to continue his enrollment without regard to race, color, religion or national origin. Under two sections of Title IV, the Federal Government makes grants to institutions of higher learning to meet problems encountered through desegregation. Section 403 makes it possible for colleges and universities to provide technical assistance to local school boards in preparing and implementing desegregation plans. These forms of assistance are provided through "desegregation centers" which are often affiliated with a university's school of education.

But it is Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 which has the greater significance for equality of educational opportunity, in that is prohibits racial discrimination in all federally assisted programs. Specifically, Title VI states that "no person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied benefits of, or be otherwise subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare." Title VI of the Act thus became a 'U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Regulation under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964,' as amended through July 5, 1973.

The passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 had important implications for Blacks in higher education. Prior to that time higher education opportunity for Blacks was limited almost entirely to historically Black colleges. For many years the enrollment in Black colleges represented about 90 percent of Black enrollment in higher education, the other ten percent attended predominantly White institutions. This situation however, usually put Black students at a disadvantaged when they had to compete with students at the predominantly White institutions. Black students tended to have lower educational attainments than their White counterparts. Christopher Jencks and David Riesman alluded to the fact that "the verbal and mathematical aptitude scores at most Negro colleges are lower than at even the worst White colleges in the same states.[2] James Coleman had established earlier a positive relationship between integration and achievement. Not only is the test average somewhat higher for Negro students in classes where most of the students are White, but also test performance varies more in these classes. [3] The Federal government took these reports seriously and soon declared for integration. The basis for action lay in Brown n. Board of Education 1954, the primary objective being to absorb Blacks into historically White institutions and systems. The provisions of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 were intended to aid in this development.

2/ Christopher Jencks and David Riesman, The Academic Revolution (New York: Doubleday and Co. Inc., 1969), p. 428

3/ James S. Coleman, Equality of Educational Opportunity, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare 1966, p. 331

Title IV of the Civil Rights Act empowers the Attorney General, on receiving a signed complaint, to bring legal action against any public college which denies a student admission or the opportunity to continue his enrollment without regard to race, color, religion or national origin. Under two sections of Title IV the Federal government makes grants to institutions of higher learning to meet problems that are encountered from time to time.

Racial segregation has, for a long time, been one of the main obstacles to access for Blacks in higher education. Some nineteen (19) states operated public colleges for Blacks during the first half of this century. These colleges were not only seperate but shared only a very small fraction of the State expenditures for higher education, the larger portions going to the White colleges. Consequently the number of graduates from Black colleges was very small, and fewer still or none at all from White colleges. Throughout the first half of this century several court decisions in desegregation suits helped pave the way for greater action to end discrimination. In 1950 the Supreme Court decided in favor of Herman B. Sweatt, that the state of Texas, by opening a segregated law school, had abrogated his constitutional right to a legal education equivalent to that offered to Whites.

Following Brown vs. Board of Education in 1954 Black students in small numbers began to attend previously all White colleges. By the middle of the 1960's over a quarter of a century of litigation and court rulings finally established the fundamental right of every citizen to be free of discrimination in the pursuit of higher education. But this only signalled the beginning of a further struggle to achieve thorough going equity for

Blacks in higher education

In October of 1970, attorneys for the NAACP Legal Defense Fund and the Washington Law Firm of Rauh and Silard filed a class action suit in the U.S. District for the District of Columbia, charging that the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare had not carried out its obligation to enforce Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The specific charge brought by the plaintiffs was that HEW was continuing to provide financial assistance to a large number of public school systems and public colleges which still engaged in segregation and discrimination, even though Title VI of the Higher Education Act of 1964 prohibited Federal support to all such institutions. This case which was then known as Adams vs. Richardson is now known as Adams v. Califano. The ten states names in the suit were Arkansas,Georgia, Florida, Maryland, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Virginia and Louisiana.

It is interesting to note the reaction of Blacks to desegregation. In 1974, the National Association for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education, an organization comprized of 110 presidents of public and predominantly Black colleges and universities, filed a brief with the Court of Appeals expressing concern that the survival of the Black colleges as well as access for Blacks to postsecondary education would be endangered by total desegregation in the States. Black citizens in several of the affected States formed coalitions to monitor the performance of HEW and State officials, and to press for equitable treatment in the sesegregation plans. Of the ten States, only Louisiana refused to submit plans, and of the nine which were

submitted in June 1974, eight were accepted.

Some changes had taken place between 1954 and 1974. A study of the Southern Education Foundation in 1974 indicated that there was a change in the composition of the student bodies at the various colleges and universities. At the time of the Supreme Court's Brown decision in 1954, nineteen states operated a total of 35 public colleges for Blacks only, with a combined enrollment of about 50,000. The Southern colleges and universities had no Black students at all. In 1974 the 35 formerly all Black institutions enrolled more than 100,000 Whites making up between 5 and 10 percent of the total population. At that time, too, the formerly all-White institutions in the same 19 states enrolled about 2.5 million students, 5 percent or more of them Black. [4]

While some progress has been made in twenty years there is a continuing disparity between the percentage of Blacks in the population and the percentage enrolled in public colleges and universities. The Southern Education Foundation reports the following:

> The gap begins early (proportionately fewer Blacks than Whites graduate from high school) and grows progressively wider: more

4/ Southern Education Foundation, Ending Discrimination in Higher Education: A Report from ten States (Atlanta, Georgia, 1974), p. 11.

> than 15 percent of the 90 million people in the 19 states are Black; yet public college enrollment in those states is no more than 10 percent Black, and Blacks make up approximately 4 percent of the undergraduate degree recipients, 2 percent of the graduate and professional school enrollment and less than 1 percent of the doctoral degree recipients. [5]

Vestiges of discrimination which remain continue to hamper further progress in equal educational opportunity. Under an order issued on April 1, 1977 by the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, the Department of Health, Education and Welfare established criteria for the desegregation of higher education in six states: Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, North Carolina, Oklahoma and Virginia. Five of these states have so far complied and reached agreement with the Department. North Carolina took some time to fall into line.

The Office of Civil Rights, on the basis of information provided by state education officials, revealed the following findings:

> A dual system still remains in effect in North Carolina's university system, with formerly all White institutions still disproportionately White (91.2 percent of the students at those schools are White) and formerly all Black institutions disporportionately Black (91.6 percent of the students at those schools are Black) Blacks constitute 19 percent

5/ I bid.

of the total student population in the 16 universities.

.....

In the eleven traditionally White universities, only 2 percent of the faculty is Black, although Blacks constitute 11 percent in the university system.[6]

This situation was typical of the problems Blacks have had to face with regard to equality of access in higher education.

Charges of discrimination of State financial aid to students were also made. For example a State scholarship program up to 1974 gave less than 5 percent of its annual allocation of voer $1 million to students at the four traditionally Black colleges in the State. In 1972 Bayola College, a private institition received more money than the four Black colleges combined. Other problems include the fact that while the states have moved some distance beyond rigid segregation in their colleges and universities, most Black colleges enroll few Whites while most White colleges enroll and employ only a small number of Blacks. For example, in 1974 fewer than 1800 of the 13,400 students in the public Black colleges in North Carolina were White, and less than 5 percent of the 37,000 students at the University of North Carolina were Black. Such disparities produced grievances which led to the Adams litigation in which North Carolina and other States became involved.

Recent information on the status of desegregation in North Carolina is somewhat encouraging however. On May 12, 1978 Secretary Califano released a statement in that direction:

6

After nine months of intensive discussions and good faith negotiations, the Department of Health, Education and Welfare and the State of North Carolina have reached agreement on a plan to eliminate the vestiges of unconstitutional segregation in the State's system of public higher education North Carolina now joins Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Oklahoma, and Virginia in developing a desegregation plan for higher education which meets criteria required by an April 1977 order of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia.

Under the Plan for desegregation in its public higher education system, North Carolina has made commitments including the following:

- To increase the enrollment of Blacks in all State colleges, and in particular, in the traditionally White school;
- To take steps which will result in more Black faculty and administrators at the traditionally White institutions; and
- To strengthen programs at the five traditionally Black-supported schools in North Carolina, so that those schools will begin to enroll students for non-racial reasons.

Some of the specific features of the North Carolina desegregation plan approved by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare include:

- A commitment to place new degree programs at the traditionally Black institutions;

. A commitment to increase the number of Black students who will enter the traditionally White institutions of the university system with the goal that in 1982 the class entering those institutions will include 1410 additional Black students.

Federal policies aimed at ending discrimination are sometimes expressed through court actions. The U.S. Supreme Court in 1954 categorically rejected the principle of separate-but-equal. Consequently, the desegregation process began in elementary, secondary and postsecondary institutions. Most states, by the end of the 1960's had hardly moved from mere tokenism. The most serious blow to the dual system of public higher education was struck in 1172, when U.S. District Judge John E. Pratt ordered nine southern states and the state of Pennsylvania to dismantle their dual systems of publicly supported higher education. This order served notice that these states as well as others were expected to establish a unitary system of higher education that would facilitate equality of access to higher education for all races. The Office of Civil Rights as well as other offices of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare also warned segregating instittuions of the danger of losing Federal grants should they continue to ignor orders to desegregate their institutions. The Federal Government also joined with local and state legislative bodies in passing enabling legislation that would effect equality of educational opportunity. This was in response to the civil rights movement of the 1960's. Such legislation included the Voting Rights Act of the 1960's, the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and the Housing Act of 1968. Several executive orders were also issued during this period.

The Civil Rights Act of 1964 is perhaps the most important in the struggle for equality of educational opportunity in general, and equal higher education access for Blacks in particular. Title VI of that act prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, or national origin in any program or activity supported by Federal funds. Each Federal agency is charged with responsibility for enforcement. Title VII of the same act precludes discrimination on the basis of race, color, sex, or national origin in employment. Enforcement responsibility for Title VII has been given to the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. Executive Order 11246 forbids contractors of Federal agencies or those contracting for projects with institutions or agencies using Federal assistance from discrimination on the basis of race, color, sex, or national origin in their employment. They must also take "affirmative action to achieve their goals.

The first articulation of the concept of affirmative action as a guide to enhance Federal policy of equal opportunity was in Executive Order 11246 issued by President Kennedy in 1961. That order established an obligation on the part of Federal contractors not only to refrain from discrimination but to undertake "affirmative action" to ensure that equal employment principles are followed in all company facilities.[7] It represented a recognition of the fact that simply terminating over practices of discrimination was not enough to make a great difference with regard to employment opportunities for minorities. Implicit in the order was the view that to the extent that employees were prepared to cooperate, the time and resources

7/Executive Order 11246, II Sec. 203.30 Federal Register 12319 as amended by Executive Order 11375, 32 Federal Register 14303 which extended coverage to women.

of the contract compliance would be better spent in the development of new channels of opportunity for minorities, than in efforts to assess culpability for past discrimination. Accordingly, specific affirmative action steps included visits to black colleges and contacts with minority organizations.

While some progress was made in the 1960's it soon became clear that companies which lacked a strong sense of will to change might make only token gestures to fultil the law. Out of this experience grew the concept of goals and time tables. Employees have been asked to compare their utilization of minorities and women with the proportion of minorities and women in the available and relevant labor pool. Contractors must then be prepared to develop goals and timetables. The goals reflect assessment of the availability of minority groups, the need for training programs, and the duration of such programs. There was to be no compulsion for the hiring of unqualified persons, nor any compromise of valid standards. There were to be no sanctions against employers for not meeting goals providing they can demonstrate that every effort was made to fulfil them.

The Federal Government, therefore, established an "affirmative action" policy to enhance equality of employment opportunity particularly for women and children. That policy was later applied to effect higher educational opportunity for minorities and women. The Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education notes that the principles of affirmative action translated from employment to educational practice may be said to imply:

1. That no policies or practices may continue to lead to discrimination against members of such groups;

2. That special efforts should be made to recruit members of these groups;

3. That compensatory education should be available to such persons when deemed helpful;

4. That special financial assistance and counseling should be provided when needed, and;

5. That goals may be set against which progress can be measured.

Weighing the Goals

It can hardly be said that there have been any dramatic results of affirmative action affecting the situation of Blacks in higher education. There have been on the one hand indications of small gains. For example, in 1969, the joint Committee on health problems in education of the American Medical Association and the National Education Association endorsed the use of equivalency tests and proficiency examination in order to provide a more systematic method of evaluating previous education and experience. This provided an opportunity for Blacks and other minorities who had served as medics or as allied health workers while in military service, to receive some form of credit for their work which would help them to enter the health professions. "Consequently, and as a result of accelerated drives to recruit black students who meet regular admission requirements, the actual number of blacks admitted to graduate and professional schools is increasing ..." notes James E. Blackwell.[8]

In general however Blacks continue to face difficulties from time to time. The study on minorities in medicine which was completed by Charles Odegard in 1977 is not very encouraging:

> The slowdown in increases in the number of first-year minority medical students beginning in 1972-73, and the decrease in their numbers in the 1975-76 entering class are very disturbing to

8/James E. Blackwell, "Access of Black Students to Graduate and Professional Schools." Southern Education Foundation, Atlanta, Georgia, 1975, p. 24.

those who have advocated the replacement of the earlier stance of receptive passivity with one of positive action by medical schools, since they do not see the desired goal yet reached.[9]

Other reports indicate a somewhat uncertain picture for Blacks in higher education. For example, the recent report on the State of Black America by the National Urban League shows that while the percentage of minority medical enrollment has been on the increase since 1974-75, the percentage for blacks has been declining. The year 1976-77 saw a decrease of -1% for Blacks compared to a .2% increase for all minorities.[10] While there has been an increase of black enrollment in law schools, from 2.95% in 1969-70 to 4.4% in 1976-77, it is the persistent rate which presents the problem. In 1974-75 there were 1,910 black students enrolled in law schools. At the end of the second year, however, there was a loss of 399 students or 20.9% of the entering class. The report notes a very serious situation. "If one follows a first year class, beginning in 1971-72, there is an approximate but consistent decrease of 400-500 students by the second year."[11] These circumstances make it difficult to measure the positive impact of affirmative action programs on higher educational opportunities for Black Americans. Title IV was intended to effect desegregation of students, faculties, and administrative personnel. The development of desegregation has had some modest positive effect on equal opportunity for blacks in higher education. One institution where this was evident was the Tenessee State University. In the fall of 1974,

9/ Charles Odegard, Minorities in Medicine (New York: The Jariah Macy, Jr. Foundation, 1977) p. 43.
10/ National Urban League, The State of Black America, 1978m p. 60.
11/ Ibid.

the total enrollment of all institutions under the governance of the Tennessee State Board of Regents was 74,437 of which 11,678 or 15.69% were black. In 1975 the number of black students rose to 13,651 or 16.25% of the total number of students. But there has been no startling increase in the number of black students entering college. On the whole it may be said that progress has come slowly but now may be regressing. A study by the Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in 1974 revealed that the percentage of entering freshman from the lowest family income quantile actually decreased (16.7% to 15.5%) from 1972 to 1974. While there was a very slight increase (23.5% to 26.7%) from the second quantile, the percentage of freshman from the third and highest quantile decreased slightly from 1972 to 1974.[12] A study by the Tennessee Higher Education Commission is reporting some interesting findings on the impact of desegregation on minority enrollment in the public colleges and universities. The student head count enrollment in the fall of 1974, was 74,437 for the institutions under the governance of the State Board of Regents. Of this number 11,678 or 15.69% were black. In the fall of 1975 the black student enrollment had increased to 13,651 or 16.25% of the total 84,015 students. The total enrollment data for the State Board of Regents System (including community colleges) without Tennessee State University shows 7,566 black students in 1974 (10.85%) and 9,258 black students (11.74%) in 1975. It should be noted that this increase was effected at a time when the proportion of white students was decreasing at the Tennessee State University (from 87.32% in 1974 to 85.0% in 1975). Black student enrollment in the community colleges increased by 1,141 from 1974 to 1975.[13]

12/ Carnegie Council on Policy Studies, the Federal Role in Postsecondary Education (San Francisco: Jossey Bass Publishers, 1975), p.15.

13/ Tennessee Higher Education Commission, Desegregation Progress Report, Nashville, 1976), pp. 23, 24.

Progress in the desegregation of undergraduate enrollment in the Tennessee University system was also noticeable of the total undergraduate enrollment in the fall of 1974, the number of black students was 10,322 (16.10%). By the fall of 1975, 12,327 (16.83%) of the 73,211 undergraduate students enrolled were black. The total black undergraduate increase including Tennessee State University was represented by 12.25%. Undergraduate student enrollment for the minorities increased only 5.49%. Excluding Tennessee State University black enrollment increased by 15.74% as compared with 5.17% for other race student enrollment. The report has predicted that by 1980-81 the State Board of Regents black undergraduate enrollment would show an increase of 35.78%, including Tennessee State University and 54.92%, excluding Tennessee State University. For the same period, other race State Board of Regents undergraduate students enrollment would increase by 18.90% including Tennessee State University and by 17.53% excluding Tennessee State University.[14]

But progress in the desegregation of law enrollment in the Texas system was somewhat disappointing according to the report. In 1974 there were only eight black law students enrolled (1.42%). In 1975 the total number (564) enrolled in the program had been reduced to 547 of which 7 were black (1.28%). It was expected that the total number of law students would increase to 574 in 1975, but it decreased instead. But the real concern is that it was expected that there would be an increase in the number of blacks from eight to fourteen, but this did not occur. Similarly the total black graduate student enrollment, excluding Tennessee State University showed a decline from 9.88% in 1974 to 9.59% in 1975.

14/ Ibid, p. 25.

The issue of desegregation and Affirmative Action has become a very serious one. For a period of 15 months prior to the June 1974 deadline for submission of state desegregation plans to HEW, the attention of all interested parties in the Adams case was focused on a single overriding question: what constitutes an adequate remedy for segregation and discrimination in public higher education. The Department of Health, Education and Welfare was in consultation and negotiation with nine states: Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Maryland, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania and Virginia. Louisiana refused to submit a desegregation plan. The National Association for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education filed a brief woth the Court of Appeals on the grounds that the survival of the public black colleges as well as access for black students to postsecondary education would be endangered by any effort of the states to achieve total desegregation. This was tantamount to a plea to save the Black Colleges. The case of black colleges has become an important issue. The concern of the part of black higher education officials for these colleges is not groundless. In every state there is a substantial disparity between the percent of blacks in the population and the percentage of enrolled in public colleges and universities. While more than 15% of the 90 million people in 19 states are black, yet no more than 10% of the public college enrollment in those states are black. The largest populations of black students are in the traditionally black institutions and urban juniour colleges. The large state universities tend to enroll the smallest number of black students. Hence the cry to save the black colleges.

In recent years the Federal government and most sates have raised their appropriations to the public black colleges and "equity handing" formulas are now employed in many cases. It is true that some critics have pointed

out that "equity" in this context is a misname isasmuch as it fails to make up for previous underfunding of black colleges which find themselves locked in a position of permanent disadvantage compared with formerly all white schools.

An important issue raised from time to ime is that of black access in higher education. But access is not enough. Blacks must be equally concerned with retention. They must keep track of the drop-out rates of blacks in the colleges and universities as they are impacted upon by desegregation procedures. This was the burden of the study by Lawrence G. Felice, and Ronald L. Richardson in 1976. The study evaluates the effects of school desegregation by court-ordered busing on the subsequent drop-out rate of majority and minority students. The results of this study could have some pointers for the issue of the impact of desegregation on the retention of blacks in higher education. The hypothesis of the study is that with the influence of school cosio-economic composition considered, the more favorable attitudes of teachers toward minority students in desegregated schools will be reflected in a more satisfying minority student school experience which will decrease the minority student drop-out rate.[15]

In their study, Felice and Richardson utilized school drop-out rates to test some of the implications of the Equality of Educational Opportunity Survey (Coleman, 1966) and of recent Supreme Court decisions (Weinberg, 1970) to desegregate schools as a remedy to the restricted educational opportunity of dual and/or segregated systems. The study expected to find, among other things, that minority student drop-out rates were higher in segregated

15/ Lawrence G. Felice and Ronald L. Richardson, "The Effects of Busing and School Desegregation on Majority and Minority Student Dropout Rates: An Evaluation of School Socio-Economic Composition and Teachers' Expectations," December 1976, ED138669

schools, and that minority student drop-out rates decrease with school desegregation. On the contrary, however, the results indicated that minority drop-out rates are highest in the bused sectors. For instance, the 1975 Black student drop-out rate on an average was 10.8% in the bused sectors, as compared with 6.2% as the average for non-bused sectors. However, the authors clearly pointed out that such results were reported in the context of carrying out desegregation merely to effect racial balance. "To desegregate schools through the use of busing in a manner which minority students are bused to run-down, lower socio-economic climate schools with teachers who hold mainly negative attitudes and expectations, simply for the sake of racial balance is of little benefit."[16]

The lessons to be learnt from the Felice-Richardson study are clear: the positiveeffects of attendance at desegregated schools for Black and other minority students is highly dependent on the quality of the schools they attend. The study notes that "it is incumbent upon those who make and carry out school desegregation policy to work to insure that black students are not penalyzed by subtle institutionally racist attitudes and expectations of the teaching staff. In this regard a number of studies cited by the Civil Rights Commission since 1967 points to changes in basic racial attitudes as a result of school desegregation, whereby black and white students and teachers have been reported as developing more favorable attitudes in integrated settings. The favorable attitudes of teachers in integrated settings therefore is a cardinal factor in the improvement of black student retention achievement and overall satisfaction with academic life.

16/ Ibid, p. 13.

The importance of the whole question of attitudes in the anti-discrimination struggle can hardly be overemphasized. In 1976 William Lewis reported that despite special recruitment efforts to increase minority participation in law schools in Colorado, serious problems had arisen: "negative attitudes based on race and sex manifested by some faculty members at Colorado University and Denver University law schools are damaging to student performance."[17] Such negative attitudes have been in part responsible for the current status of affirmative action which is hardly very optimistic. The Illinois Board of Higher Education noted in 1974:

> Only if institutions re-order priorities, work at changing attitudes and use differently the dollars they are committing to Affirmative Action related efforts will we see any significant movement toward equity...[18]

The problems facing the movement toward equity for Black Americans may be better understood through a consideration of their social, economic as well as educational status. Black Americans constitute the largest minority group in the United States, and comprise almost 12% of the total population i.e. approximately 24.4 million. A significant number of that population are still concentrated in low skilled, unskilled and service occupations. For example, while 27% of employed white hold professional, managerial and technical positions, only 13% of non-whites hold such positions. Blacks comprise 5.7% of white-collar workers; 5.8% of professional and technical workers; 1.4% of the engineers; 6.5% of teachers, not including college teachers; and 6.4% of medical and other health workers.[19]

18/ Report of the Committee on Affirmative Action, by D.E. Bell, p.12.

19/ Bureau of the Census, The Social and Economic Status of the Black Population in the United States, 1974. Special Studies Series P-23, No. 54: Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1975, p. 10.

Discriminatory practices in education, craft unions and industries have denied Blacks of the opportunities for full participation in many aspects of American life. They still suffer from income disabilities, despite limited gains in the 1960's. The income gap between Blacks and whites is still wide enough. For example, while the income of white families rose by 8% in 1975 to $14,000, that of the Black family increased by only 5% to $8,200. Between 1974 and 1975 Black median family income declined from 58% of the white median family income to 57. The proportion of Black middle-income families decreased from one-fourth in 1973 to one-fifth in 1974. Therefore only about one of five families in the Black population had an income of $15,318 (A Bureau of Labor Statistics Intermediate Level) in 1975.[20]

The education gap between Blacks and whites is also very wide. The proportion of whites who are able to complete elementary, secondary and postsecondary education is still considerably greater than that for Blacks and other minorities. The median number of years of schooling for Blacks is about 10, while that for the white population is in excess of 12. Approximately 85% of the white population between the ages of 20 and 24 have completed high school as compared with 72% of the Black population. About three times as many white males (24.9%) as Black males (8.8%) have completed four years of college or more. Graduate and professional school enrollment of Blacks has been very low resulting in the fact that Blacks comprise less than 3% of all physician, about 2.2% of all dentists, and about 1.5% of all lawyers. Only one out of every 426 Ph.D's in the United States is Black and only

20/ Ibid, p. 20, No. 302, p. 9.

about 1% of all engineers are Black Americans.[21] These are the kinds of inequities which have had to be addressed from time to time, and for which solutions are being sought by increased financial aid to Black students as well as by other forms of Federal intervention involving the legislative, executive and judicial branches of the Federal Government. A recent statement by the Commission on Civil Rights has revealed a decline of minority participation in various types of professions. The statement while admitting that some progress has been made in recent years the minority enrollment of American schools was only 8%, including 4.8% black. Medical schools had a similar enrollment pattern with an 8% minority enrollment including 6% black students. Although Black constitute 11% of the population, yet only 2.2% of them are physicians, 3.4% are lawyers and judges and 1% engineers. On the other hand some enrollment gains have been made as a result of the implementation of various forms of affirmative action and special admissions programs. Thus, by 1975, there were 426,000 more Black students in college than there were in 1970, representing an 80% increase. Also, by 1975, the proportion of Black high school graduates between the ages of 18 and 19 who enrolled in college approximated the proportions of white college enrollees or about 50%.[22]

The recent ruling of the Supreme Court in the Bakke case will have serious implications for affirmative action programs. The court has upheld the principle of affirmative action, but it also ordered the University of California to admit Allan P. Bakke. The whole question of quotas for special programs has been under attack for some time, and the Court has

21/See the Commission on Human Resources and the National Research Council Summary Report, 1975: Doctorate Recipients from the United States Universities, Washington, D.C., National Academy of Science, May 1976.

22/Bureau of the Census, "School Enrollment" Social and Economic Characteristics of Students: October 1975, Series P-20 No. 303, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office (December 1976), p. 2.

frowned upon them especially if they are determined by race. The Washington Post summarized very well the main points relating to the decision: (1) Mr. Bakke gets in to medical school (2) Special admissions programs to colleges and universities cannot be based solely on race; (3) the University of California gets a chance to revise ots special admissions program; (4) those programs can still be used to increase minorities representation in student bodies as long as factors in addition to race are involved in them. The general consensus is that this is the first time the High Court has upheld affirmative action. It is to be hoped that the future will see further enhancement of equal educational opportunity there.

II ON STUDENT FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

Federal student aid programs have now reached considerable proportions. The six need-based student aid programs of the Office of Education will absorb approximately $2.9 billion in 1978. These six programs are authorized under Title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended- Basic Educational Opportunity Grant, Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grant, College Work-Study, National Direct Student Loan, State Student Incentive Grant, and Guaranteed Student Loan programs.

The Basic Educational Opportunity Grants program in the Education Amendments of 1972 represented 2 major steps toward a policy of Federal aid to higher education designed to foster equal educational opportunity. The following advantages are likely to accrue from the BEOG program:

-- It would encourage free student choice of institution and field of study.

--Through its emphasis on aid to students rather than aid to institutions, it would encourage diversity and preserve institutional autonomy and integrity.

-- It would assist both public and private institutions.

-- As an integral part of its contribution to equality of opportunity, it would assure a relatively large flow of student aid funds to states and areas with low per capita incomes, and to institutions that enrolled large proportions of low-income students.[23/]

24/Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education, The Federal Role in Postsecondary Education (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975), pp. 22-23.

The Basic Educational Opportunity Grant program has come to be regarded as the cornerstone of Federal student aid for needy students. The FY 1978 budget request for the program is $2.3 billion, which constitues more than 70 percent of the total request for all OE student aid programs. The program is of special significance to Black students. When the program began in 1973, about 36 percent of the Black college students who knew of it applied for grants as compared with 19 percent of the White students.

The maximum basic grant authorized is $1600, actual awards being reduced by an expected family contribution. Individual awards may not exceed one half of actual total costs of attendance. Eligibility includes students from families with incomes up to approximately $15,000. Many Black families fall within this range. BEOG is considered by many as an important weapon in the struggle to improve access for Blacks in higher education.

The Basic Educational Opportunity Grant program holds great promise for access to higher education for Black Americans. In 1975 the Consortium on Financing Higher Education, Hanover, New Hampshire, conducted a study on "Federal Student Assistance" in which it generated some important recommendations. The report recommended that BEOG be transformed into a clearly focused national access program. In order to accomplish this it is recommended that the maximum BEOG grant be related to the national average of non-instructional costs (board, room, books, transportation and personal expenses) less a summer earnings expectation of the student rather than to total costs of attendance as has been the case hitherto.

Relating the maximum BEOG grant to noninstructional costs would benefit Black colleges and universities. These colleges, like all others, have found it necessary to use their financial aid resources to subsidize not only the instructional costs of needy students, but also their maintenance costs as well. Federal BEOG awards to eligible students based on non-instructional costs would be a way of freeing institutional funds for more proper subsidization of educational costs.

In the Supplementary Educational Opportunity Grant program, funds are made available to educational institutions to assist students with "exceptional need." i.e. those students whose family contribution does not exceed one half the cost of attendance. Individual awares may not exceed $15000 or $4,000 for four years. The supplementary grant program is aimed at the problems faced by low- and middle-income students who wish to attend moderate high-priced-institutions. This group of students whether attending public or private institutions, is specially in need of tuition related help, since they are neither subsidized by low tuitions nor aided adequately by State scholarship programs. Many Black students also fall in the preview of SEOG.

The State Student Incentive Grant program provides grants designed to assist eligible students with "substantial financial need" by matching on a 50-50 basis new grant dollars expended by the States over a base year. Funds are allocated to the States that apply and are eligible based on the number of students in attendance at institutions of higher education in the States. Black students were reasonably well represented among the estimated 76,000 students who received Federal SSIG funds totalling $19 million in 1974-75.

Adequate funding of the SSIG program has always been urged for a number of important reasons. First of all, State governments should support private as well as public institutions, and such support should be in the form of State tuition grant programs. Since many Black Colleges and Universities are private institutions, SSIG should benefit them well. The primary responsibility for planning the future development of higher education rests with the States and a strong State program will enhance it. Federal funds in the form of SSIG have contributed to this, in stimulating the States to adopt scholarship programs. State student aid programs have made considerable progress in recent years. The total amount of aid provided by State scholarship programs in 1965-66 was only $72 million. By 1974-75 the total amount for comprehensive State undergraduate student aid programs was $456 million. Federal funds made available for the first time in 1974-75 undoubtedly played a major role in the noted increase in the States' student aid programs.

The Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education has emphasized the need to establish a Tuition Equalization Grants program whereby the State would be able "to assist private higher education to maintain, or perhaps even increase its share of total enrollment."25/ These grants would be made to all students attending private institutions of higher ecuation without a needs test. Low-income and lower-middle-income students in private institutions could qualify for supplementary tuition grants under the SSIG program. Like the state scholarship program the tuition equalization grant program would be administered by the States. Federal matching funds

---

25/The Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education, The Federal Role in Postsecondary Education, Unfinished Business, 1975-1980 (San Francisco: Jassey-Bass Publishers, 1975) p. 36.

would greatly assist the states in developing such programs. Black students stand to benefit from such programs, since most of the Black colleges are private, and many Black students fit the categories of low-income and lower-middle-income.

Another program which ahs been considerably helpful to minority students is the College Work-Study Program. Originally authorized by the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, the authority for the program was transferred to the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended, by the Higher Education Amendments of 1968. Designed for students in great financial need the program serves to stimulate and promote part-time employment. Each institution is responsible for determining the eligibility of students participating in the program. One of the major aspects of the program is the development of jobs for students awarded fudns. On the whole, the CWS program has been successful as a form of student aid. There is even good evidence that many more students could be employed under the program. In that case more Black students can hope to benefit.

The National Direct Student Loan Program is a continuation of the National Defense Student Loan Program authorized by Title II of the National Defense Education Act of 1958. Statutory authority is found in Title IV, Part E of the Higher Education Act of 1965, and Title II of the National Defense Act of 1958. The program assists in the establishment and maintenance of low-interest, long-term deferred loan programs at institutions of post-secondary education to provide loans to needy students. Undergraduates may know a maximum of $5000 and graduate students are limited to $10,000. Up to 100 percent of the loan may be cancelled if the borrower teaches in an economically deprived area or teaches the handicapped.

The present maximum for BEOG is authorized at $1600, an amount which is not based on any particular rationale. Actual awards are reduced by an expected family contribution based income and assets. Individual awards may not exceed one helf of actual total costs of attention. Awards are based on appropriations in any given year, with notable deductions in awards as necessary. Eligibility includes students from families with incomes up to approximately $11,000-$12,000. Certain proposals have suggested that the BEOG program be transformed into a national access program by relating the maximum grant not to total costs of attendance, but to the national average of non-instructional costs, less a summer earnings expectation of students.

Basic Educational Opportunity Grant programs as one of the key Title programs which has been of considerable help to Black students has been under heavy criticism from time to time. Some observers are critical of the lack of clarity with regard to the relationship of BEOG to other Federal, State, and private student assistance programs. Others express some concern over the amount of maximum entitlement, $1400 not being based on any particular economic nationale or program goal, fails to provide a basis for a determination of the objectives of the program. Still other criticisms center around the fact that access to the program is unduly restricted by the family contribution schedule. In response to that critism various changes in the family contribution schedule were effected for both 1974-75 and 1975-76 Academic years. These were also complaints of discrimination against the cost needy students resulting from the use of notable methods for reducing grants when the program is less than fully funded.

Many of the student financial programs that aid Blacks and other minorities are primarily intended for students from low-income families. In cases in participation rates of such students have been noted up to 1969. However with the holding back of spending between 1969 and 1972 increases in participation rates were less pronounced among lower-income students.

PARTICIPATION RATE
PERSONS OF AGE 18-24 BY FAMILY INCOME, 1972 26/

FAMILY INCOME	PARTICIPATION RATE
$ 0 - 3,000	15%
3,000 - 5,000	19%
5,000 - 7,500	26%
7,500 -10,000	32%
10,000 -15,000	41%
Over 15,000	56%

Frank J. Atelsek and Irene L. Gomberg presented highlights of Federal finacial aid programs for 1976-77:

Characteristics of Recipients:

-- More than 1.9 million students received aid in 1976-77 from five Office of Education aid programs at more than 3,000 colleges and universities; 73% of the recipients were enrolled in public institutions.

-- About 35 percent of all aid recipients were minority students, ranging from 49 percent of recipients at public two-year colleges, to 17 percent at private two-year colleges.

26/Source: National Commission on the Financing of Postsecondary Education, Financing Postsecondary Education in the United States (Wahsington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1973), p. 27.

Use of Programs:

-- 73% of all students aided received support from the BEOG program, 39 percent received support from theNDSL program, 36 percent each from the GSL and CWS programs, and 22 percent from the SEOG program.

-- Minority students made up 32 percent of BEOG recipients at private institutions, 46 percent at public institutions, and 43 percent overall.

-- Of the nearly 700,000 students in the CWS progra, 29 percent were minoirty-group students, and 5 percent were enrolled part-time.[27/]

Federal aid to higher education is primarily intended to assist students rather than institutions. The Education Amendments of 1976 extended all student financial assistance programs with major changes in some of them. Approximately $2 billion is currently being spent on three of these programs-Basic Education Opportunity Grants, Guaranteed Student Loans and College Work-Study. The largest program of all, BEOG, when enacted in 1972 had a maximum grant award of $1400 but not to exceed one-half of the cost of attendance at the institution where the student is enrolled. Entitlement awards for the 1977-78 academic year borders $1.5 billion. The Education Amendments of 1976 raises the maximum per student award to $1800, effective at the beginning of the 1978-79 academic year. This change will result in raising the cost for operating the program to $2.5 billion.

27/American Council on Education, Higher Education Panel Reports, Number 36, September 1977, pp. v-n.

Other changes in the BEOG program include the following: (1) Setting new legal dates for the establishment of an annual schedule of the contributions the family will make to the student's education. Such contributions are very important in the determination of awards. The new time schedules will make it possible for the student to be provided with application forms at a reasonably early date that would facilitate his or her plans for the coming academic year; (2) Deduction of the educational expenses of other dependent children as a factor in the determination of the family contribution; (3) Authorization of appropriated funds being carried forward to the next year providing that the amount does not exceed 15 percent of the appropriation; (4) Authorization of a $10 payment per BEOG student to institution to cover costs for providing information to students and prospective students. A new provision in the Education Amendments of 1976 authorizes the Commissioner to enter into agreement with two to five States for the processiong of BEOG applications, effective from the beginning of the 1977-78 academic year. All forms for the BEOG program are now centrally processed. The new method provides for the use of a single application for State and Federal grant awards. However, any State entering into this agreement is prohibited from having authority over BEOG criteria. The provision also stipulates that the fee which the State receives for processing should not exceed the contract costs incurred by Federal central processing. Other provisions affecting states include a new program , Training of Student Financial Aid Officers, for which the annual authorization for each of the years, 1977 and 1978 is $280,000. The program is designed to make incentive grants on a matching basis not to exceed $10,000 for states to develop and train institutional and state administrators.

Certain changes in the 1976 Amendments have to do with dissemination of information on student assistance. A new program provides for the planning, establishment and operation of Educational Information Centers. The Commissioner is authorized to make grants to states that would cover two-thirds of such costs. The program provides information, guidance, counselling and referral services to those needing such services. Other provisions on student information include the requirement that institutions receiving certain payments under the Basic Educational Opportunity Grants program or the Guaranteed Student Loan Program must disseminate certain kinds of information to students as prospected students beginning July 1, 1977, including the full range of financial aid benefits, the real costs of attending the institution, the real costs of attending the institution, and student responsibilities under financial assistance programs.

The National Defense (now Direct) Student Loan Program which dates from the National Defense Act of 1958 is the oldest student financial aid program. Under Title II of the NDEA the National Defense Student Loan Program was inaugurated in Fiscal Year 1959 with an appropriation of $31 million. Other financial aid programs were enacted in the mid 1960's following raising college costs, increasing numbers of new college aspirants, and the national awakening to the fact that financial aid could be a means to alleviating inequalities in educational opportunity. In 1964 the College Work-Study program was enacted as part of the Economic Opportunity Act. Several new programs including the Education Opportunity Grant program were authorized by the Higher Education Act of 1965, to aid students with "exceptional need." The Guaranteed Student Loan program was also authorized to insure the availability of Federal loan insurance to students among othe things.

Prior to 1972 the College Work-Study program catered to students from low-income families; the Education Opportunity program focused on students with exceptional financial need; the National Defense Student loan program addressed "need" as the financial criterion of award in its operations the Office of Education was expected to emphasize the Education Opportunity Grant program as being primarily for students with family incomes below $9,000, while a slightly higher income group was served by the College Work-Study program and a still higher income level by the Guaranteed Student loan program and the National Defense Student loan. relationships were altered or improved by the Education Amendments of 1972.

The major change effected by the Education Amendments of 1972 was the establishment of the Basic Educational Opportunity Grant program as the principal access program for students from low and lower-middle income families. The Education Amendments of 1972 also stipulated the replacement of Education Opportunity Grant program by the Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grant program whereby both students who qualify for the Basic Educational Opportunity Grant and those who do not are considered eligible recipients of SEOG. A new program created by the 1972 Act, the Student Incentive Grant program placed great stress on the expanding state role in student finacnial aid and thereby opened up greater channels of state's financial assistance to students. Whereas in the past the College Work-Study program had catered to students from reasonably high family incomes the 1972 Act required that students of great financial need would be given preference. Some revisions were made in the National Defense Student Loan program which was renamed the National Direct Student Loan Program.

The proportions of minority students participating in student financial aid programs have declined in five programs. These declines were smallest in the loan programs: 1 percent in the GSL program and 3 percent in the NDSL program. The greatest decline occurred in the SEOG program (9 percent) followed by the BEOG program (5 percent); the decline in CWS was 3 percent. About 695,000 college and university students received loans under GSL 1976-77, of which only 17 percent were minority students. There was, however, a slight increase in the proportion of minority students among the total of aid recipients. 28/

In 1972-73, Black student enrollment was ahead of that for Whites and Spanish American in general according to type of financial aid and type of school. Of the students enrolled in postsecondary education receiving Federal and 41.2 percent were Black, 20.6 were White, and 34.9 were Spanish-Americans. Of the total number of students in postsecondary education, who had received Federal loans 22.7 percent were Black and 11.6 percent were White. Of those receiving aid from other Federal programs 5.0 percent were Black and 4.7 were White.

The total number of students enrolled in the nation's colleges during the 1976-77 academic year was 11.2 million, of which 14% were minority students. Over 1.9 million college and university students received assistance under one or more of the major Federal student financial assistance programs. A little over one-third (35 percent) of all aid recipients were minority-group members. Among the minority students receiving BEOG awards, 69 percent

28/American Council on Education, Estimated Number of Student Aid Recipients, 1976-77, p. 10.

were Black. Overall, minority students made up a larger proportion of BEOG recipients at public institutions (46 percent) than at private institutions (32 percent).

Only at the university level did the proportion of minority recipients in the private sector exceed that in the public sector (37 percent and 34 percent, respectively).

The proportion of minority participants varied according both institutional setting and program. The proportions of minority aid recipients at the different types of institutions were as follows:

Type of Institution	Minority Participation (unduplicated count)
Public, Total:	39%
University	30%
Four-year college.....	35%
Two-year college	49%
Private, Total:	23%
University.....	24%
Four-year college	24%
Two-year college	17%

The minority participation rates for the different student assistance programs in 1976-77 were as follows:

PROGRAM	MINORITY PARTICIPATION
BEOG	43%
SEOG	39%
CWS	29%
NDSL	26%
GSL	17% 29/

29/American Council on Education, Estimated Number of Student Aid Recipients, 1976-77, Higher Education Panel Reports, No. 36, Sept. 1977, p. 5.

A comparison of the 1974-75 and 1976-77 Higher Education Panel Surveys reveals that while there has been a general increase in the number of recipients of Federal financial assistance awards, there has been a slight decrease in the number of minorities receiving such awards in the BEOG, SEOG, CWS, NDSL and GSL programs. For example in 1974-75 minority recipients for BEOG were 48.1 percent of the total as compared with 43 percent in 1976-77. Minority recipients in the SEOG program in 1974-75 constituted 47.8 percent while in 1976-77 they constituted 39.1 percent. Minority participation in CWS was 32.6 percent in 1974-75 and 29.3 percent in 1976-77. Minority recipients in the 1974-75 NDSL totaled 28.9 percent, and 25.7 percent in 1976-77. 30/

Notwithstanding, the slight decline in the numebr of minorities receiving awards between 1974-75 and 1976-77 there has been an increase in the minority enrollment in institutions of higher education during the same period. In 1974 the total number of undergraduates in the nation was 8,161,232 of which 1,164,580 or 9.2 percent. 31/ By 1976 the total number of undergraduates was 8,513,310, of which 1,492,342 were minorities. The numebr of Black students in 1976 increased to 866,315 or 10.2 percent of the total, i.e. an increase of 1 percent. 32/

30/Ibid., p. 21.

31/U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare/Office for Civil Rights, Racial and Ethnic Enrollment Data from Institutions of Higher Education, Fall, 1974, p. 179

32/Ibid, 1976.

Everywhere answers are being sort to questions regarding the impact of Federal financial aid to disadvantaged students. A recent study (1977) at Brigham Young University has compared the achievement of federally-funded students and non-federally funded students. The results of the study revealed the following:

1. No significant difference existed in the final grade point average of funded students and the average of non-funded students in the sample.
2. Federally-funded students had a significantly lower grade point average at teo colleges, but were significantly higher at the third.
3. As a total group funded students achieved as well as non-funded students (ERIC ED 146962).

It is difficult to assess the impact on access of Federal financial aid for Black students. At best it can be said that the picture rises and falls. Larry L. Leslie has put it this way:

> According to demand theory, if the large need-based student aid programs have been achieving their goals of promoting equality in access and choice, it would be expected, cetems paribus, that low-income enrollments would berising both overall, and at the higher-priced, more selective, four-year and private institutions. However, the increasing costs of college attendance will have absorbed some of the subsidies and may have attenuated the enrollment effects of these aid programs for low-income persons. 33/

33/Larry L. Leslie, Higher Education Opportunity: A Decade of Progress Washington, D.C.: The American Association for Higher Education, 1977, p. 14

The principles stated here have special relevance for Blacks since they generally fall in the lower-income category. It is true that slight improvements in access for Blacks have been noted. However, as Leslie correctly observes, "in spite of relatively improving access for low-income youth, on absolute grounds they ahve not achieved enrollment parity with those of greater means.

Federal financial aid has had some impact on enrollment rates and for Blacks in higher education. In 1975 Carlson reported on four attitudinal studies of various student aid programs, with observations that the attendance decisions of many student aid recipients were dependent to a large degree on student aid. It was noted that the portion of aid recipients whose decisions were changed from non-attendance to attendance were inversely related to family income. Since Black students are usually from low-income families, it is likely that they would be highly affected. A clear majority of low-income youth stated that the financial aid program had made the difference in their ability to attend college.

In general, money problems or related difficulties in attending college are often cited by larger percentages of low-income students not attending college. In 1976,a study by Leslie Johnson of 1000 New York and Pennsylvania high school students who were within one month of graduation revealed that financial problems were reported among six times as many nonattendees as attendees at college. Many of these nonattendees were undoubtedly Blacks. It is quite possible then when Federal financial aid is applied the enrollment increase among Blacks and other minorities immediately improves. For example, data from the annual ACE surveys for 1966 through 1975 suggest that in ten years the minority share of enrollments grew from a little over 9 percent to 13.5 percent. Indeed some increase in access for Blacks has been noted in recent years. The ACE survey figure of 5.0 percent for Black freshmen in 1966 increased to 9.0 percent in 1975. Reasonably high

correlation exists among freshmen enrollments by race and aid and race and costs. While aid and costs have gone up the White share of freshmen enrollments seems to have gone down, while the non-White share seems to have gone up.

But although there has been some improvement in the situation regarding entry for Blacks in higher education, the whole question of parity in access needs to be carfully studies. For example, while 12 percent of all 18-21 year-old Americans in 1975 were Black, only 9.0 percent of the freshman class were Black. This introduces another dimension. A study by William Sedlack in 1974 revealed that the school most successful in enrolling Blacks tended to emphasize academic programs (special or general) while the least successful schools tended to emphasize money in recruiting Black students. Could this be the basis for the disparity which exists between the total number of 18-21 year old Black Americans and the number of Black college freshman? On the whole, however, the situation may be somewhat encouraging. Taking the totality of Black students into consideration, Black enrollments increased by 80.8 percent in 1970, compared with 30.9 percent for all students. 34/

Financial aid will continue to be an important factor in equal educational opportunity, and Black students will continue to rely on such aid. In 1971 the College Entrance Examination Board conducted a study of the college choices of thirty Black students in Project Opportunity, a talent search program which sought to increase the numebr of minority and poor students entering higher education. Of the 30 Black students in the program, 22 chose to attend integrated institutions for two main reasons: (1) they saw

34/Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports, School Enrollment -- Social and Economic Characteristics of Students (Washington, D.C.), Series, P-20.

integrated schools as offering a more challenging experience; and (2) they did not receive prompt and efficient information and notification from the Black schools as to the awarding of financial aid.

However , it can be said that enrollment rates for Blacks have not been very good over the past nine years, having reached their peaks in 1969, and a major upturn in 1975. The largest enrollment rate decrease (from 39.4 to 34.1 percent or 5.3 percent) has occurred in the $10,000 to $15,000 income bracket. In the lowest income brackets (under $5000), enrollments rose by 3.3 percent. The improvement noted for the low-income groups might well be attributable to Federal student financial aid, low-income students, and therefore many Black students are under-represented in colleges and universities, both public and private. Further, it is imperative that Federal financialaid be kept up in order that retention and completion rates of Black students be improved. For while some gains have been realized in Black access to higher education, Blacks continue to be underrepresented, and their retention and completion rates are somewhat disappointing.

It is a well-known fact that th goal of more equitable proportions of groups of differing income levels actually attending colleges is far from being achieved. Students from relatively well-to-do backgrounds continue to attend college at rates far greater than those of students from the lower-income brackets. Nontwithstanding the fact that middle-income students continue to attend college in greater numebrs than lower-income students it is worth noting that both groups have failed to achieve increased access relative to the more prosperous asegment of the population. To the extent

that reducing disparities between income-level and college attendance is a major vehicle for achieving universal access, it would that only small progress has been achieved.

A study by the Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in 1975 supports the view that there might even be a regression. The data for that study show that the percentage of entering freshmen from the lowest family income quartile actually decreased (16.7 percent to 15.5 percent) from 1972 to 1974, while the percentage from the second quartile only slightly increased (23.5 percent to 26.7 percent in the corresponding period. There was a very slight drop in the percentage of freshmen from the third and fourth quartiles from 1972 to 1974. 35/ However, despite the slowing of enrollment increases between 1972 and 1974, recent Census Bureau data indicate that there is some narrowing of the Black/White enrollment gap. In 1969, 236,800 Black men attended college; in 1975, a total of 422,000 attended having increased from 5 to 9 percent (Freshmen and Holloman, 1975, p. 26). This increase in the percentage of Black males attending college has not been matched by a correspondence increase in the numebr of Black women attending college. Consequently, only modest gains in the percentage of Blacks attending college have been effected.

Salvatore B. Corrallo and Junius A. Davis have recently completed a study of the impact of financial aid on postsecondary entrance and persistence (1977). The percentages of students receiving Federal aid and enrolled in postsecondary institutions to ability and race and type of school are

35/Carnegie Council on Policy Studies, The Federal Role in Postsecondary Education, 1975, p. 15

presented for 1972-73. Among the high ability students 43.4 percent were Black, 23.1 were White and 38.7 were Spanish American. For the medium ability, 49.4 percent were Black, 19.0 percent were White, and 36.1 percent were Spanish American. In the low-ability category, 34.4 percent were Black, 15.8 percent were White, and 32.8 percent were Spanish American. Of the students enrolled in two-year colleges and receiving Federal student aid 29.2 were Black, 14.4 percent were White, and 24.5 percent were Spanish American. In the four-year colleges 54.3 percent of the students receiving Federal aid were Black, 24.4 percent were White and 56.8 percent were Spanish American. In the vocational-technical schools, 28.4 percent were Black, 20.9 percent were White, and 39.9 percent were Spanish American. The grand total showed 41.2 percent Black, 20.6 percent White and 34.9 percent Spanish American.

In his study of financial aid and student enrollment (1977) Gregory Jackson takes a very cautious view of the impact of Federal aid, however. He admits that student aid does have an impact on students' decisions whether to attend college. Aided applicants are some 8.5 percentage points more likely to attend than their counterparts who are largely unaided. These effects are somewhat larger to low-SES students, those with poor grades, or those from North Central cities. Moreover, the effect of aid on which of several offers of admission to student favors is substantially larger. However only a small increase in the college-going rate

---

attributed to expanded Federal student aid programs between 1969 and 1972. Indeed Gregory even suggested that student financial aid may not be the most

efficient way to increase demand for higher education. If Title III colleges increased their enrollment over these years (after adjusting for expansion of the eligible population), then those effects probably are not due to student aid, but may be due to the Title III program itself.

While money is very important, it should not be overemphasized as a factor in the survival of Blacks in higher education. A recent study by Paul Fidler and Eunice Ponder of student survival rates at the University of South Carolina revealed that Black survival rates were consistently higher than White rates for each of the three years studied. Survival is defined as the percentage of students in an entering class who return for a second or subsequent years' enrollment at the University. The results of the study showed that Black survival rates varied from 81.6% to 84.0%, while Whites rates varied from 74.1% to 75.6%. The authors of the study warn that money can be overstressed, and that a recruiting emphasis on what a student will be studying rather than on the money available appears to work better, even with students who may be badly in need of money.

Jonathan D. File also commented of the importance of other than financial factors in the matter of Blacks achieving parity with Whites in access. The problem which exists is due to the fact that the concept of parity is based on the assumption that there are no nonfinancial reasons which might prevent low-income groups from participating in higher education. However, if the nonfinancial reasons for the low-income group are compelling, parity would not be very easy to achieve notwithstanding the amounts of financial aid provided. 36/

36/See Jonathan D. File, Applying the Goals of Student Financial Aid

III. ON COMPENSATORY EDUCATION

Federal policy in compensatory education was first built on the expectation that the degree of special attention needed in later years depends on the success of treatment in preschool and primary grades. This view was influenced by the work of Benjamin Bloom, whose studies in 1964 revealed that intelligence is achieved or formed principally before the age of 6, 37/ Work at the Max Plank Institute tended to confirm the assumption that early experience determines the nature of later experience. Such assumptions gave rise to compensatory education programs such as Head Start and Follow Through. Other compensatory education programs were bound to follow. Robert L. Williams refers to compensatory education programs as educational programs for disadvantaged students whose educational and economic backgrounds are considered marked by inferior to that of regular students. 38/

The Federal Government has an abiding interest in equal educational opportunity, and has therefore committed itself to helping the disadvantaged. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 in a general way reflects the Federal interest and commitment. The Act was formally entitled "An Act to Strengthen and Improve Educational Quality and Educational Opportunities in the Nation's Elementary and Secondary Schools." The House report accompanying ESEA emphasized the "close relationship between condition

37/See Benjamin Bloom, Stability and Change in Human Characteristics. New York: Wiley, 1964

38/Robert L. Williams, What Are We Learning from Current Programs for Disadvantaged Students. (Columbus, Ohio State University Press, 1968) p. 275.

of poverty and poor academic performance." One of the fundamental purposes for establishing Title I, therefore, was to contribute to the cognitive, emotional, social or physical development of participating students. Black and other minority children stand to benefit from the effort.

Congress clearly intended that Title I funds be used for programs aimed at children with special needs. Indeed, some Congressional statements imply that the purposes of Title I form an hierarchy in which funds and services are delivered with the sole intent of increasing students' academic achievement. The special needs of the academically disadvantaged were to be adequately met. It was determined by social scientists in 1968 that students from culturally different backgrounds are generally less able to use conventional verbal symbols in representing and interpreting their feelings, experiences, and environment. 39/ Congress, therefore, has special interest in the funding of programs designed to compensate the inadequacies of low-achieving culturally different students.

During the past few years the Federal government has given attention to the education of the culturally different including Blacks. This has resulted in a number of Federal programs which have provided assistance to many institutions of higher education and their culturally different populations. These programs have attempted to focus on areas of greatest need and include support for recruitment, special services, student aid, professional employment, curriculum development, postsecondary vocational education, adult and continuing education, teacher training, research

39/Martin Deutsch, Inoyh Katz, and Arthur R. Janise, Social Class, Race and Psychological Development (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1968) pp. 116-120.

related to the culturally different, and library aid. Some of these programs include Upward Bound, Special Services and Student Aid.

Community Colleges, many of which serve large numbers of Black students, have experimented with Federally supported compensatory education programs such as Project Focus, a continuation and extension of the Upward Bound program. In particular, Project Focus has helped make the resources of two-year colleges available to Upward Bound students. It has also helped to place students in colleges in parts of the country which are new to them. For example, through its operation many Black students from Florida, Louisiana, and Texas have been able to enter colleges such as Peralta College, which is located in an all White, predominantly, middle class community.

The role of the Federal government in compensatory has been even more prominent at the preschool and elementary and secondary levels. The Anti Poverty Program, which stemmed from the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, helped to provide for direct assistance in achieving the new, vital educational program that was so needed to help the deprived. The Head Start program was also instrumental in helping those children of poor families who lacked many of the early experiences which form the basis for formal education. Like Head Start, Follow Through, a research and evaluation program, was designed to find the most effective way to educate low-income children in the early grades, basically K-3. As its implies the program was conceived in 1967 as one that would capitalize on the gains made by Head Start children. The major emphasis of Title I of ESEA is on meeting their special needs. It is in Title I that the

Federal Government has made available the largest sum of money to be spent through local determination of need. Subsequent amendments to Title I have made the distributions of more adequate funds to poorer sections. Early in the history of compensatory education it was held that special programs should start with the early grades. Soon money became so targeted on the early years that half of the nation's disadvantaged children, those in grades 7 through 12, received only a fraction of the money allotted to the younger groups.

There are two major categories of compensatory education programs and practices in postsecondary education: (1) those that assist culturally different students in entering institutions of higher education; and (2) those that help them succeed in academic and occupational-oriented studies after they have enrolled. Compensatory practices that assist culturally different students in entering institutions of higher education include modified recruitment, admissions and financial aid. Compensatory practices designed to assist the culturally different after they have entered college include instruction in basic communication skills, teaching English as a second language, tutorial programs, flexible evaluation, extended school, summer programs, cultural enrichment, Black Studies, special instructional practices, and extensive guidance and counseling. Very often some of these practices are combined. Many of these practices have also been utilized by Federally sponsored programs such as Upward Bound, Talent Search and the College Discovery Program.

Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 is the principal vehicle for aiding disadvantaged children. Like Head Start of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, its focus is on children from low-income families. As passed by Congress in 1965, Title I, ESEA, was intended to provide financial assistance to local school districts in planning and operating special programs for educationally deprived children. It is a supplemental program and is not intended to be used to supplant current programs provided children in the district. Under Title I any local education agency (LEA) which has at least ten children, aged 5 to 17, in one or a combination of the following four categories is eligible for funds:

1. Children in resident families with an annual income below $2,000
2. Children in families with an annual income above $2,000, who receive aid for families with dependent children
3. Children in local institutions for the neglected or delinquent
4. Children living in foster homes and being supported by public funds.

In addition to meeting the needs of students who are financially disadvantaged, compensatory education programs serve students who experience environmental deprivation, lack exposure to traditional educational experiences, and usually perform inadequately on standardized intelligence tests. Black students, then, are usually candidates for compensatory education programs. The success or failure of these programs at any level of education might well have an impact on the higher educational opportunities of Black students. Successful Head Start programs might impact on the elementary and secondary performance levels of Black students, and successful compensatory education programs at the secondary level might well determine the success of Black students at the postsecondary education level.

But the emphasis on early compensatory education programs is the hope that they will obviate the need for later compensatory education programs has been seriously challenged. For a variety of reasons many students fail to benefit from early programs. Even those who do well in early programs sometimes tend to fall behind when they reach junior high school level. In addition, it is argued that disadvantaged adolescents have special learning needs that cannot be met by early interventions. It has been argued therefore that there is need for a new strategy which will take into account the appropriate needs of education throughout the school career of the disadvantaged students.

A study by the Philadelphia School District in 1975 evaluated compensatory education programs from 1965 to 1975. One of the major points of the study is that compensatory education during the early years is not enough: "The results of the program's third year clearly indicate, as they did during the program's second year, that an additional thrust is needed at the secondary level."

The three programs which represent the Federal Government's major efforts to bring higher educational opportunity to the economically, culturally, or educationally disadvantaged students are Talent Search, Upward Bound, and Special Services for Disadvantaged Students. All three programs are funded under Title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended: They are also known as the TRIO program. The primary criteria is the low-income factor, and additionally many students also belong to ethnic minorities. For instance, according to a report in 1972-73, there were 44,000 Spanish-named, 25,000 American Indians, and 88,000 Black students who participated in the programs.

Talent Search programs work closely with schools and community agencies to identify students from seventh grade up with academic potential, actively involving youth groups to find those who may have been overlooked in traditional settings. Students receive information about educational opportunities in colleges and universities, vocational and technical schools and on-the-job training, as well as placement assistance and information on sources of financial assistance.

Special Services for Disadvantaged Students cater to students in post-secondary institutions who may suffer from academic deficiencies, physical impairment or lack of financial resources. The programs attempt to keep students in school by providing benefits such as counseling, tutoring, remedial summer programs, and information on sources of financial aid. Upward Bound attempts to help students "turned off" by the traditional values of schooling. Students receive intensive preparation for entry into postsecondary programs including counseling, special classes and tutoring.

During the past decade the Federal Government has been active in its support of special programs at the high school or college level, in an effort to help students who are educationally disadvantaged to raise their levels of interest in and capability for pursuing higher education. Federal as well as foundation support in this regard is designed to equalize access for prospective students, who by reason of poor expense to traditional learning situations, or discrimination rising from their poverty origin or minority group membership, have not been prominent in the mainstream of American higher education. Such Federal programs as

Upward Bound and Talent Search are typical of the special efforts to increase motivation and capability for continuing higher education.

The Higher Education Act of 1965 gave birth to the Talent Search program which was to be employed as a mechanism for identifying financially needy students and helping them to take advantage of the Educational Opportunity Grant Program. Talent Search is a discretionary grant program which operates through colleges and universities as well as public and private (nonprofit or profit) agencies or organizations. The main objectives of the program are: (1) to identify youths of extreme financial or cultural need with an "exceptional potential" for postsecondary education and encourage them to complete secondary school and undertake further education; (2) to publicize existing forms of student aid, including aid furnished under the Higher Education Act; and (3) to encourage school or college dropouts of demonstrated aptitude to re-enter educational programs. The program has been administered by the U.S. Office of Education since it was originated, and operated under the legislative authority of Title IV of the Education Amendments of 1974.

The Upward Bound program was established by the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. In the summer of 1965, the Office of Economic Opportunity funded 17 Upward Bound projects as a pilot program. In 1966, Upward Bound was authorized as a national program under Title II-A of the Economic Opportunity Act. Responsibility for the program was transferred from the Office of Economic Opportunity to the U.S. Office of Education in 1969. The program is currently authorized under section 408 of the Higehr Education Act of 1965.

At the same time that the Federal Government was moving toward the establishment of Upward Bound, several large foundations including the Rockefeller and the Carnegie Foundations, had been receiving proposals from a number of colleges, asking their support for summer programs, which though uncoordinated, had one goal in common: the development of a college= sponsored program which would greatly strengthen the aspirations of disadvantaged students to pursue postsecondary education. The civil rights movement played a not inconsiderable role in this development, and soon many people from its ranks joined hands with students and faculty in a strong cooperative relationship that was so very essential. Six Black colleges and universities were among the institutions where Upward Bound pilot programs were funded in the summer of 1965: Dillard University, Fisk University, Howard University, Texas Southern University, Webster College, and Morehouse College.

The Upward Bound program was designed to reach low-income high school students with potential for successfully completing a postsecondary education program, but who, due to inadequate preparation or lack of motivation, are prevented from pursuing higher education or from fulfilling standard requirements for admission to a college, university or technical institute. Remedial instruction, exposure to new or altered curricula, tutoring and cultural enrichment are some means used to help students acquire the skills and motivation necessary to enter and complete postsecondary education. Upward Bound projects are usually sponsored at two- or four-year colleges or universities. During fiscal year 1973, there were 416 projects operating in the United States and its territories, serving some 51,755 individual participants at a total cost of $38.3 million. Black students are prime targets for these projects.

Of the total number of Upward Bound students entering postsecondary institutions in the last five years, about 75 percent enrolled in 4-year colleges or universities, and about 20 percent entered 2-year junior or community colleges. The remaining students entered vocational, trade or other schools. Comparable figures for other entering students were about 45, 30 and 25. The data also indicate that 13 of 20 Upward Bound students entered postsecondary education as compared to 8 of 20 non-Upward Bound students. The program therefore has meaning for Black access to higher education since their rate of participation is high.

In July 1973 a comprehensive study of the Talent Search program was begun by the Research Triangle Institute of North Carolina under contract with the U.S. Office of Education. In addition to the broad purpose of providing a description of the scope and native of the program and its operation, the study included a validity assessment of the postsecondary enrollment data as reported by the various projects. The study also surveyed the post-secondary school enrollment status of about 2000 talent search clients, who were reported by project directors as having begun college or other postsecondary schools in the summer or fall of 1973. Funding constraints prevented an evaluation of the success and national impact of the program.

In general, the talent search study claimed that the program has been meaningful in its thrust to facilitate access to higher education for the disadvantaged. Among the achievements in this regard are:

1. ETS increased educational opportunities for the disadvantaged (minority, the "forgotten" or neglected) student by sensitizing officials at postsecondary institutions to the needs of these students.

2. ETS attempted to encourage (assist or motivate) students to enter a postsecondary institution especially the disadvantaged or low-income persons, while at the same time increasing the educational opportunities available for these students.

3. ETS helped to upgrade postsecondary admissions policies for the academically borderline students. It worked with officials at various institutions as an advocate for these students, thus establishing good working relationships with postsedondary officials and getting more students accepted into their institutions. 42/

The majority of clients entered the Talent Search program as a result of active recruitment (about 65 percent) followed by referrals from school personnel, other programs, community organizations and former clients. In general, the criteria for financial or cultural need were applied, although occasional use was made of the "exceptional potential" criterion. Virtually any person requesting assistance was served by the program. The The emphasis being less on seeking out eligible or special individuals than on serving those who respond to it. Clients were from many ethnic groups, Blacks constituting the majority: 48 percent were Black: 19 percent were White; 18 percent Chicano; 10 percent American Indian; 4 percent Puerto Rican; and about 1 percent were others of Spanish descent, Orientals, or Eskimos. In 1973, about half the clients had incomes of less than $6000, about 40 percent had incomes between $6000 and $9000, and about 10 percent had incomes above $9000.

42/A Study of the National Upward Bound and Talent Search Programs. Final Report 22 U-889. Volume III. Research Triangle Park, North Carolina: Research Triangle Institute, December 1975, 5.15

The Upward Bound recruitment process is facilitated by the reciprocity of information among the students. Other sources from which considerable proportions of individuals derive information on the program include school guidance counselors, Upward Bound staff memebrs, and school teachers. Project directors assumed final responsibility for the final selection of students using various criteria including the low-income guidelines. In attempts to lessen the difficulties associated with "academic risks," project staff relied on specific course grades, grade averages, aptitude test scores, teacher or counselor recommendations, evidences of student motivation (or lack of it), and personal intuition in selecting students for the UB program. About 61 percent of the UB students were Black, 18 percent were White, and the remainder were American Indians, Hispanics, Asians or unclassifiable.

Among the participants of the UB program, 71 percent entered postsecondary education, as compared with 47 percent nonparticipants. There was evidence that among high school graduates, PSE entry rate was positively related to length of participation in the program. Specifically, the percentages entering postsecondary education wer: 78 percent of high school graduates who had participated in UB in grades 10 through 12, 69 percent of the students who were participants in UB in grades 10 through 12, and 68 percent of the students who were UB participants only in grade 12. 43/ It was observed that UB participants not only planned and expected to attend postsecondary education in greater numbers, but also made greater progress than non UB participants.

43/Evaluation Study of the Upward Bound Program: A First Follow-Up Final Report 22U-889. Research Triangle Institute, September 1977, 2-12.

The Special Services Program offers assistance to qualified students who meet the low-income criteria, or who are physically disabled, or have limited English-speaking ability, and who are accepted or are already enrolled at an institution of higher education which sponsors a special services program. Special tutorial programs are offered during the academic year, and curriculums are developed and tailored to fit the special needs of students. The program goes further and helps students plan their careers and assist them in gaining admission to professional or graduate schools. Special services may operate a reading laboratory or conduct special classes for students with a language handicap.

On the whole the Special Services program serve more Black students than students from other ethnic-racial background. For instance, in 1977 the program served 2883 Alaskans, 36441 Asians, 38,916 Blacks, 4,249 Hispanics, and 25,883 Whites. Blacks were also in the majority among those served by the Upward Bound program: 24,027 Blacks, 9510 Whites, 2,034 Indians, 267 Orientals, 3,371 Mexican-Americans, and 1284 Puerto Ricans. 44/ These groups are also well served by the College Discovery and Development Program in some colleges.

The primary objective of the College Discovery and Development Program, funded under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Title I, has been the discovery and development of the college potential of high school youth who are academically and financially disadvantaged. The program provides remediation in reading and mathematics to sophomores, juniors and seniors

44/See March 1978 report of Computer Sciences Corporation. Interim Performance Report on Special Services, U.S. Office of Education

in fairly large numbers. The major long term objective of the College Bound Program is to prepare disadvantaged students for college. Many Black students are served by the program.

In 1976 the New York City Board of Education reported the results of an evaluation of the College Discovery and Development Program for eleven years (1965-1976). Throughout that period the program operated with the joint sponsorship of the City University of New York and the New York City Board of Education. The approach has mainly involved both identifying the special nature of these students' educational requirements and providing intensive educational support during their time in the program, the intent being to increase the likelihood of the students entering college. The program was designed to demonstrate increments that show statistically significant difference in the readingand mathematics performance of those students who comprised the target population.

A new program, the Service Learning Centers program has been authorized under the 1976 Amendments. It would provide up to 90 percent of the costs of establishing, operating and expanding centers of remedial and allied special services for students in postsecondary institutions that enroll substantial numbers of disadvantaged students. However, the provision prohibits funding in any fiscal year in which the appropriations for TRIO do not equal those of fiscal year 1976 ($70.331 million). The program is not currently being funded. Whenever the program is funded and becomes operational it will provide remedial and other special services for students who are enrolled or accepted for enrollment at a postsecondary institution. It will also serve as a concentrated effort to coordinate and supplement the ability of such an institution toffurnish such services to students.

Mention must also be made of the Educational Opportunity Centers program which was added to the TRIO program in 1972. That program provides up to 75 percent of the cost of establishing and operating Educational Opportunity Centers which would serve areas with major concentrations of low-income populations. The centers provide information with respect to financial and academic assistance available for low-income persons, assistance to such persons applying for admission to postsecondary institutions, and counseling services and tutorial and other necessary assistance to such persons while attending such institutions. Further, the centers serve as recruiting and counseling pools to coordinate resources and staff efforts of institutions of higher education and other institutions offering programs of postsecondary education which admit educationally disadvantaged students. In program year 1976-77 the participants were Blacks (35 percent), Hispanics (12.7 percent), Whites (38.9 percent), other, including Asian Americans (3.3 percent.

The Trio program has also been amended to include the broadening of the Talent Search program with emphasis on the identification and encouragement of qualified youths of inancial or cultural need with an exceptional potential for postsecondary educational training, especially those youths who have delayed such training. Other amendments to the TRIO program include doubling the authorization of appropriations, and assisting persons disadvantaged through severe rural isolation as well as through physical handicap. The Commissioner is also authorized to enter into contracts with institutions of higher education and other appropriate public agencies and non-profit private organizations to provide training for staff and leadership personnel who will specialize in improving the delivery of services to students.

The tasks ahead are still very challenging as far as the Federal role in equal educational opportunity is concerned. It is even generally agreed that it is difficult to assess the outcome of Federal policies and outcomes so far. One can use certain measures with discretion. For instance, academic achievement is the variable most often used tome asure the effect of desegregation on students educational success. In general, studies have shown that Black students' scores do not seem to be adversely affected by the desegregation situation and may improve substantially in certain circumstances. Other ways of assessing the significance of Federal policies is through assessments of their impact on enrollment.

A recent study by Patricia K. Smith and Laura Kent (1977) dealt with the impact of the Basic Grant Program on the States. One of the effects of the BEOG program in conjunction with State awards is the impact on student enrollment, especially with respect to the balance of enrollments between the public and the independent sectors. Undergraduate enrollments at independent colleges dropped significantly between 1969 and 1973, thereby resulting in a major shift from the independent sector to the public sector. Overall there was a general increase in access to higher education. Access to institutions in both sectors increased, with enrollments rising faster in the independent sector to the public sector. The fall 1976 enrollment data show further increase in the independent sector, compared with a statewide enrollment decline of 3 percent (New York). Perhaps, for the first time in the history of New York State has there been a shift from the public sector back into the independent sector. 45/

45/Patricia Smith and Laura Kent, The Impact of the Basic Grant Program on the States. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1977, p. 6.

A second effect of BEOG has been on migration. Increases in the State awards appears to have reduced the out migration of New York State students to out-of-State institutions. In 1963 about 19 percent of all first-time students entered out of State colleges; by 1968, the proportion had declined to about 12 percent, and in 1975 the figure had dropped to 8 percent. Although many factors incluence migration patterns, it seems likely that the combination of BEOG and the State entitlement awards has contributed to student decisions to remain in the State. 46/

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Four kinds of Federal policies currently are aimed at effecting greater access for Blacks and other disadvantaged students in higher education: (1) Desegregation policy which seeks the abandonment of fual racial systems of public and nonprofit educational institutions, and the prohibition of racial discrimination in the administration of all Federall assisted programs. This policy is effected through Titles IV and VI respectively of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Affirmative action also aims at eliminating discrimination. (2) Compensatory education policy effecting special programs aimed at improving admissions and retention of disadvantaged students. This policy is effected through Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. (3) Financial assistance policy whereby Federal support is given to students as well as institutions of higher education through Title III and Title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (Amendments of 1872). Each of these policies

46/Ibid.

interlocks with the other toward the general goal of equality of educational opportunity for all.

Recommendations:

1. Title I has been a valuable program and should receive full funding. Financial need should continue to be the sole basis for entitlement.

2. Now that the decision on the Bakke case has been arrived at, every effort should be made by the Federal Government to strengthen and support the Affirmative Action Programs in colleges and universities.

3. The future should see more funds going toward grants, scholarships, fellowships and work-study opportunities, rather than loans.

4. The Office of Education should insist on criteria for evaluating grant applications that give a priority to the funding of "prototype" projects -- those that involve school systems in which the likelihood that Title IV assistance will help make desegregation work is strongest--and should assure that the size and duration of the grant will be sufficient to facilitate success.

5. The Federal Government should resolve to provide more substantial means of support for Black Colleges and Universities.

6. Funding for the BEOG program should be authorized to increase gradually on a basis that can be matched by the states and which should represent achievable increases in relation to existing state scholarship expenditures.

7. The Federal Government should join the states in monitoring the effects of Student aid programs. There is also need for some kind of policy that would set goals concerning the desirable level of aid to the private sector.

8. Consideration should be given to the calculation of student award amounts on the basis of total educational costs rather than merely on tuition and room and board.

9. Appropriation for all Federal student aid programs should be increased over the next several years in an effort to enhance the equal educational opportunity of Blacks and other minorities.

10. Full consideration for financial aid without restrictions, should be given to all students, whether they be part-time or full time.

11. Continued Federal support should be given to Upward Bound, Talent Search, Educational Opportunity Centers and other Special Programs for Disadvantaged students.

12. In time it might be necessary to revise the provisions governing the funding of the Service Learning Centers which would allow them to function without restrictions. These centers could be very useful in providing postsecondary education remedial work for disadvantaged students.

13. Consideration should also be given to new developments in compensatory education that would replace the earlier strategy with one that provides for equal and age-appropriate efforts throughout the grade levels.

14. The Federal Government should provide for research and development efforts to classify long-term and mid-range goals for compensatory programs, and develop measurement tools appropriate to the goals.

15. Special efforts should be made to identify successful compensatory education projects.

16. Every effort should also be made to eliminate both implicit and explicit biases in regulations, guidelines and administrative practices against compensatory education for adolescents.

17. If Blacks and other minorities are ever to achieve equalized enroolment, research estimating financial needs must be done. The main reason for this is that money has become an important factor in deciding whether or not Blacks complete postsecondary education or indeed even begin such an education. Research in the area of social needs is also important.

18. More research should be done to analyze the process of social adjustment to determine what specific skills are needed as individuals move from a segregated to an integrated situation.

REFERENCES

American Council on Education. Estimated Number of Student Aid Recipients. Higher Education Panel Reports No. 36, September, 1977.

Astin, Helen and Astin, Alexander. Higher Education and the Disadvantaged Student. Washington, D.C.: Human Service Press, 1972.

Bloom, Benjamin. Stability and Change in Human Characteristics. New York: Wiley, 1964.

Boyd, William M. Desegregating America's Colleges. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1974.

Bureau of the Census. "School Enrollment" - Social and Economic Characteristics of Students. October, 1975. Series P-20. No. 303 Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, December, 1976.

Bureau of the Census. The Social and Economic Status of the Black Population in the United States, 1974. Special Studies Series, P-23, No. 54. Washington, D.C. : U.S. Government Printing Office, 1975.

Carnegie Council on Policy Studies. The Federal Role in Postsecondary Education. San Francisco:Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1975.

Carnegie Council on Policy Studies. Making Affirmative Work in Higher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1975.

Civil Rights Act of 1964, P. L. 88-352, Sections 403-404.

Coleman, James S. Equality of Educational Opportunity. U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1966.

Commission on Civil Rights. Twenty Years After Brown. Washington, D.C. 1974

Commission on Human Resources and the National Research Council. Summary Report, 1975. Doctorate Recipients from the United States Universities. Washington, D.C.: National Academy of Science, May 1976.

Crossland, Fred E. Minority Access to College. New York: Schocken Books, 1971.

Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Non-discrimination in Federally-Assisted Programs, Regulation Under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended through July 5, 1973.

Department of Health, Education and Welfare/Office for Civil Rights. Racial and Ethic Enrollment Data from Institutions of Higher Education, Fall, 1974.

Deutsch, Martin, Katz, Irwyn, and Janse, A.R. Social Class, Race and Psychological Development (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968).

Epps, Edgar (ed.). Black Students in White Schools. Worthington, Ohio: Charles A. Jones Publishing Company, 1972.

REFERENCES

Gordon, Edmund and Wilkerson, Dorey. Compensatory Education for the Disadvantaged, New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1966.

Jencks, Christopher, and Riesman, David. The Academic Revolution, New York: Doubleday and Co. Inc., 1969.

Leslie, Larry L. Higher Education Opportunity: A Decade of Progress. Washington, D.C.: The American Association for Higher Education, 1977.

Levis, William and Others. Access to the Legal Profession in Colorado by Minorities and Women. Denver, Colorado: State Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1976.

Miller, Le Mar P. and Edmund W. Gordon. Equality of Educational Opportunity, New York: AMS Press Inc.

National Commission on the Financing of Postsecondary Education. Financing Postsecondary Education in the United States. Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1973.

Odegard, Charles. Minorities in Medicine. New York: The Jariah Macy Jr. Foundation, 1977.

Rees, Helen E. Deprivation and Compensatory Education. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1968.

_____. A Study of the National Upward Bound and Talent Search Programs. Final Report 22U-89, Volume IV. North Carolina: Research Triangle Institute, April, 1976.

Research Triangle Institute. Evaluation Study of the Upward Bound Program: A First Follow-up. Final Report 22U-89, September 1977.

Smith, Patricia, and Kent, Laura. The Impact of the Basic Grant Program on the States. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1977.

Southern Education Foundation. Ending Discrimination in Higher Education: A Report from Ten States. Atlanta, GA., 1974.

Tennessee Higher Education Commission. Desegregation Progress Report, Nashville, 1976.

Williams, Robert L. What Are We Learning From Current Programs for Disadvantaged Students (Columbus, Ohio State University Press, 1968).